UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,088	10/23/2003	Joe M. Wood	VTN-5003-USA-NP	8320

27777 7590 02/11/2008

PHILIP S. JOHNSON
JOHNSON & JOHNSON
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER	
CARRILLO, BIBI SHARIDAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1792	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/692,088	WOOD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sharidan Carrillo	1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 January 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18 and 20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The limitations of shrinking the swollen contact lens to within 5% of the functional size constitutes new matter, not supported by the specification as originally filed. Specifically, paragraphs 6, 9, 19 and 32 teach shrinking the contact lens back to "its function size". The specification does not teach shrinking to "within 5% of the functional size". Therefore, the limitations constitute new matter. The limitations of shrinking said swollen contact lens to within "5% of the original diameter size of the contact lens" is not supported by the specification as originally filed. Once again, the specification does not state that lens is shrunk within "5%" of the functional size or original diameter size. Consequently, the limitations of 5% constitute new matter, not supported by the originally filed specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 is indefinite because the "buffered aqueous salt solution is indefinite since it is ultimately dependent on claim 1, which does not recite a buffered aqueous "salt" solution as part of the Markush group. Claim 1 recites a "buffered aqueous solution" and not a buffered aqueous "salt" solution.

5. Claim 18 contains the trademark/trade name Etafilcon. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe soft contact lens and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1-13, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Driscoll et al. (3829329).

O'Driscoll teaches a method of cleaning contact lenses. In reference to claim 1, O'Driscoll teaches swelling the contact lens with a 0.9% NaCl solution followed by shrinking with hydrogen peroxide (col. 9, lines 53-58). Fig. 3 clearly teaches that both the hydrogen peroxide and saline steps clean the contact lens. Specifically, Fig. 3 teaches "Equilibration and washing out products with a Normal Saline solution". Fig. 3 also teaches cleaning by oxidation using hydrogen peroxide. Additionally, col. 3, lines 1-10 teaches that the contact lens are made from polymeric materials (methylacrylate) which contain a certain amount of impurities which include methacrylic acid, and dimethyacrylate. In the absence of a showing of criticality, and since O'Driscoll teaches performing the same method steps as the instantly claimed invention and further teaches cleaning the contact lens by performing the hydrogen peroxide and saline steps, and further teaches that polymeric impurities are present on the contact lens, one would reasonably expect the cleaning steps of O'Driscoll, as described in Fig. 3 to further remove polymeric impurities present on the lens surface. In reference to claims 2-7, refer to Fig. 3. In reference to claim 9, refer to col. 10, lines 24-33. In reference to claim 11, refer to col. 1, lines 30-33. In reference to claim 12, Fig. 3 teaches osmotic swelling for 4 hours. In reference to claim 13, Fig. 3 teaches 200F, which is equivalent to 93C. In reference to claim 18, refer to col. 5, lines 5-7, 60-63.

Re claims 1 and 20, O'Driscoll fails to teach swelling contact lens that is 5% or larger than the functional size or shrinking lens within 5% of the functional size or

shrinking the contact lens to within 5% of the original diameter size. However, one would reasonably expect swelling to be 5% or greater since O'Driscoll teaches expanding the core diameter of the lens to 35% and thickness to 23%. Additionally, paragraph 11 of the instant specification teaches swelling to include 10-60% of water content. O'Driscoll teaches swelling the lens to include a water content of 40-80%. Therefore one would reasonably expect the swelling of O'Driscoll to increase to at least 5% increase of the functional size. One would reasonably expect shrinkage to be within 5% of the functional size since O'Driscoll teaches reversing the effects of swelling using a 3% hydrogen peroxide solution.

In reference to claim 8, O'Driscoll fails to teach the difference in ionic strength. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of O'Driscoll to include a difference in ionic strength in order to cause the swelling and shrinking of the contact lens. In reference to claims 10 and 20, O'Driscoll does not specifically teach expanding the core diameter by at least about 1mm. However, col. 10, lines 28-30 teaches that the core diameter expands 35% and the thickness expands 23%. It would have been within the level of the skilled artisan to modify the method to include increasing the diameter to 1mm since O'Driscoll teaches that the core diameter expands to 35% and the thickness expands to 23%.

10. Claims 1-3, 7-17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayyagari et al. (WOO1/45868A1).

Ayyagari teaches a method of pulsed extraction of residual materials from

contact lenses. Ayyagari teaches varying the concentration of the primary solvent and a co-solvent. As the amount of co-solvent increases, the lens swell. As the amount of co-solvent reduces, the lens shrink. Ayyagari teaches pulsed extraction cycle in which the co-solvent (IPA) begins at a lower first amount and then is increased to a second higher amount (swelling with 20%IPA) and then is returned to the lower first amount (shrinking with 5%IPA). During each pulse, the lens goes through one cycle of expansion and shrinkage. Re claims 1 and 20, Ayyagari teaches removing unreacted monomers by treatment with the IPA, as described on page 5, last paragraph. Claims 2-3 are met as a result of increasing the concentration of IPA during the swelling step. The limitations of claim 7 are met since Ayyagari teaches using an aqueous solution of IPA. In reference to claim 9, Table 1 shows varying degrees of expansion as a result of varying concentrations of IPA. In reference to claims 10 and 20, the limitations are met since Ayyagari teaches expanding the lens to 79% (Table 1). In reference to claim 11, refer to Table 1. In reference to claim 12, refer to page 9, Fig. 3. In reference to claim 13, refer to page 8. In reference to claim 14, refer to page 11. In reference to claims 15-16, the limitations are met since Ayyagari teaches that diluents need to be extracted from the contact lens and further teaches extracting in a series of steps using supercritical fluid in combination with IPA. It is the combination of all of the extraction steps which result in the removal of diluents from the lens. Therefore, the limitations are met by Ayyagari.

Re claims 1 and 20, Ayyagari fails to teach swelling that is 5% or larger than the functional size or shrinking the lens within 5% of the functional size or within 5% of the

original diameter. However, one would reasonably expect swelling to be 5% or greater than the functional size since Ayyagari teaches expanding the lens as the concentration of IPA increases and shrinking the lens back to its original state as the IPA concentration decreases.

In reference to claim 8, Ayyagari fails to teach the difference in the ionic strength. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Ayyagari to include a difference in ionic strength in order to cause the swelling and shrinking of the contact lens. In reference to claim 17, Ayyagari fails to teach contact lens which are tinted. However, it would have been within the level of the skilled artisan to include tinted lenses since Ayyagari teaches that any type of lens can be used for the extraction process.

11. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ayyagari et al. (WO01/45868A1) in view of Qui et al. (2004/018295).

Ayyagari fails to teach the limitation of claim 18. Qui et al. teaches swelling and shrinking of contact lens (paragraphs 196-197). In paragraph 102, Qui teaches it is conventional in the art to manufacture biomedical devices (such as contact lenses) with materials made of Elastofilcon. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of Ayyagari to include Elastofilcon, as taught by Qui, which are used conventionally in the manufacture of contact lenses.

Response to Arguments

12. The rejections of the claims, under 112, first paragraph, new matter, is maintained for the reasons set forth above.

13. The rejection of the claims, under 112, second paragraph, is maintained for the reasons set forth above.

14. Applicant argues that O'Driscoll fails to teach extracting excess materials which include unbound monomer, unbound polymer, and colorant. Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive for the following reasons. In the absence of a showing of criticality, and since O'Driscoll teaches performing the same method steps as the instantly claimed invention and further teaches cleaning the contact lens by performing the hydrogen peroxide and saline steps, and further teaches that polymeric impurities are present on the contact lens, one would reasonably expect the cleaning steps of O'Driscoll, as described in Fig. 3 to further remove polymeric impurities present on the lens surface. Furthermore, Fig. 3 clearly teaches that both the hydrogen peroxide and saline steps clean the contact lens. Specifically, Fig. 3 teaches "Equilibration and washing out products with a Normal Saline solution". Fig. 3 also teaches cleaning by oxidation using hydrogen peroxide. Furthermore, the title of O'Driscoll et al. is directed to "Method of cleaning soft hydrophilic contact lens".

15. Applicant argues that Ayyagari fails to teach exposing the lens to a first liquid comprising of a saline solution, an organic solvent, deionized water, and buffered aqueous solutions and then a second liquid comprising of a saline solution, an organic solvent, deionized water, and buffered aqueous solutions. Applicant's claim is so

broadly interpreted to include pulsing a liquid, wherein the liquid is IPA, which reads on an organic solvent. Applicant argues that Ayyagari fails to teach the limitations of claim 3. Re claim 3, the limitations are met as a result of increasing the concentration of IPA during the swelling step. Specifically Ayyagari teaches increasing the IPA to 20% and then reducing the IPA to 5%, therefore, the ionic strength of the first liquid (20% IPA) would be greater than the ionic strength of the 5% IPA solution.

16. Applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach etafilcon A. Applicant's arguments are unpersuasive. Claim 18 recited etafilcon, which is a trade name, the generic terminology being soft contact lens, as evidenced by Hydrogel Lens Materials, 1999. Further, refer to paragraph 102 of Qui.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharidan Carrillo whose telephone number is 571-272-1297. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W 6:30-4:00pm, alternating Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sharidan Carrillo/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

bsc